

**Planning & Development Department
Scanning Cover Sheet**

Case No A-0001-56

APN

Location VEGAS DR

Applicant UNDERHILL

Subject

ANNEXATION OF THE WEST 332 FT OF THE SOUTH EAST
QUARTER OF THE SOUTH WEST QUARTER SECTION 20
T20S R61E MDB&M



*File - ~~Reed~~
Annex Request*

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, CERTAIN SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; DECLARING SAID TERRITORY AND INHABITANTS TO BE ANNEXED THERETO AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES; ORDERING A PLAT SHOWING SAID TERRITORY TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to a Petition duly presented to the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, signed by a majority of the freeholders in the area containing the hereinafter described parcel of real property requesting the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas to annex to and make a part of the City of Las Vegas, the hereinafter described parcel of real property, the exterior boundaries of the City of Las Vegas are hereby extended to annex to, and include therein, the following described parcel of real property, to-wit:

A certain tract or parcel of land, lying and being in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, and being a portion of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec. 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, and being more particularly described as follows to wit:

The W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M.

TOGETHER with the tenements, property and inhabitants within said parcel of real property is hereby declared to be a part of the City of Las Vegas.

SECTION 2. Said parcel of real property, together with the tenements and inhabitants thereof, shall be subject to all of the laws applicable to the City of Las Vegas.

SECTION 3. The City Engineer of the City of Las Vegas is hereby instructed to prepare plats of said territory described in Section 1 of this Ordinance and to file the same for record in the office of the County Recorder of Clark County, Nevada.

SECTION 4. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its final passage and publication as in the next section provided.

SECTION 5. The City Clerk and Clerk of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas shall cause this Ordinance to be published once a week for two successive weeks immediately following its first reading and adoption in the Las Vegas Review Journal, a daily newspaper published in the City of Las Vegas.

ATTEST:

REED WHIPPLE, Mayor Pro Tem

SHIRLEY BALLINGER, City Clerk

The above and foregoing Ordinance was first proposed and read by title to the Board of Commissioners on the 1st day of August, 1956, and referred to the following committee composed of Commissioners Fountain and Sharp for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported favorably on said ordinance on the 15th day of August, 1956, which was the regular meeting held on said day, and at said regular meeting held on said day, the proposed ordinance was read in full to the Board of Commissioners as first introduced and adopted by the following vote:

Voting "Aye": Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp and Whipple

Voting "Nay": None Absent: Mayor Baker

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

REED WHIPPLE, Mayor Pro Tem

SHIRLEY BALLINGER, City Clerk

July 26, 1956

City Clerk

Director of Planning

Legal Description - Underhill & Reardon Property

The proper legal description for the proposed Underhill and Reardon annexation, as supplied to us by the Right-of-Way Department, is as follows:

A certain tract or parcel of land, lying and being in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, and being a portion of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, and being more particularly described as follows to wit:

The W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of
Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M.

Franklin J. Biles

FRANKLIN J. BILES

FJB/wt

Use this legal as proper legal on
Ord. & Publications: Underhill & Rardon Prop.

A certain tract or parcel of land, lying
& being in the County of Clark, State of
Nevada, and being a portion of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of
the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec. 20-20-61 MDB+M, and
being more particularly described as follows
to wit:

The W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the W $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec 20. T20S, R61E MDB+M.

Use this please \uparrow
Dwight E.
R/W agent.
7/26/56

Las Vegas, Nevada
April 18, 1956

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, held this 18th day of April, 1956 was called to order at the hour of 7.30 P.M. by His Honor Mayor Baker with the following members present:

Mayor	C. D. Baker
Commissioner	Wendell Bunker
Commissioner	E.W.Fountain
Commissioner	Harris P. Sharp
Commissioner	Reed Whipple
City Manager	A. H. Kennedy
Asst. City Manager	Robert W. Notti
City Attorney	Howard W. Cannon
Planning Director	Franklin Bills
Works Engineer	Vic Uehling
City Clerk	Shirley Ballinger

Absent: City Engineer George E. Wade

LOG CABIN LIQUOR
LICENSE

Mayor Baker announced that William Morse, attorney for Albert and David Mengarelli owners of the Log Cabin Bar had requested a continuance of the hearing on their show cause why their liquor license should not be revoked for sale of liquor to minors.

Commissioner Bunker moved this matter be deferred until May 2, 1956, and the suspension of this license continue until that time.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none.

ANNEXATION -
Sec. 20, T20S, R61E

The Commission considered the petition for annexation of the west 332 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M. The Planning Commission recommended that this annexation be approved.

Commissioner Fountain moved this annexation be approved and the City Attorney instructed to prepare the ordinance.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Sharp and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none.

FIRE EQUIPMENT LOAN

Mayor Baker presented the request of the City of Henderson for the loan of a fire truck for a period of ninety days.

Commissioner Whipple moved that a fire truck be loaned to the City of Henderson for ninety days.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Sharp and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none.

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Director of Planning Franklin J. Bills presented supplementary information relative to the Urban Renewal Program.

Commissioner Bunker moved this supplementary information on Urban Renewal be approved and submitted to Housing and Home Financing Agency.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, in a regular meeting on the 4th day of April, 1956, having considered the application of Pioneer Builders Inc. for variance to reduce the rear yard requirements from 23.9 feet to 20 feet on Lots 7,8,11,14,15 and 18, Block 4 and Lots 7,8,11,14, 15 and 18, Block 5 of Sunset Manor Tract #1; and

The Board having considered the recommendation of the Board of Adjustment approving this application.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is the decision of this Board that the application of Pioneer Builders, Inc. for various, be and the same hereby is approved.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Whipple and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none.

USE PERMIT-U-12-56
O.M. Snodgrass

Consideration was given to the application of O.M. and Melva Snodgrass for a use permit to convert and existing dwelling for the maintenance and operation of a day and night child nursery at 2314 Fairfield Avenue.

The Board decided to hold this application in abeyance until April 11th to give the applicant an opportunity to contact the Child Welfare Board and get a recommendation from this Board.

ANNEXATION -
Sec. 20, T20S, R61E

The recommendation of the Planning Commission that the petition for annexation of the West 332 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 20, R61E, MDB&M be approved was considered.

This matter was held in abeyance until the next meeting.

VIRGINIA MANOR #1
Tentative Map

Commissioner Sharp moved the tentative map of Virginia Manor #1 be approved subject to an equitable agreement with the Las Vegas Union School District.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none.

JUDY RICH TRACT #2
Tentative Map

Commissioner Whipple moved the tentative map of Judy Rich Tract #2 be approved.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none. Commissioner Sharp passed his vote.

ENSELY PLACE #1
Tentative Map

Commissioner Fountain moved the tentative map of Ensely Place #1 be approved, subject to an equitable agreement with the Las Vegas Union School District.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Sharp and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Sharp and Whipple voting aye; noes, none. Mayor Baker declared that he was interested in this subdivision and declined to vote.

CHARLESTON HEIGHTS
NO. 5

Commissioner Bunker moved the request for ninety days extension on Charleston Heights No. 5 be approved.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Whipple and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Bunker, Fountain, Whipple and His Honor voting aye; noes, none. Commissioner Sharp passed his vote.

April 5, 1956

Murray Hoyt
617 $\frac{1}{2}$ Shadow Street
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Hoyt:

The following described property, now located in the jurisdiction of Clark County, is being considered for annexation to the City of Las Vegas:

The SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, T20S, R61E, and the
E $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDBSM.

Inasmuch as our ordinance requires that any annexation of territory in the jurisdiction of Clark County be annexed with the same zoning classification, or nearest possible zoning classification prescribed by the governing body of the former jurisdiction, it is requested that you advise this office of the present zoning classification on the above described property.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN J. BILLS
Director of Planning

FJB/wt

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

March 29, 1956

Honorable Mayor and Board of City Commissioners
City Hall
Las Vegas, Nevada

Gentlemen:

At a regular meeting on March 27, 1956, the City Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the annexation of the West 332 feet of the Southeast quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$), Section 20, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, be approved.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN C. LEMAS, Sec'y.
City Planning Commission

FLL/st

cc: City Manager

March 29, 1956

D. J. Underhill
2916 Ashby Ave.
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Underhill:

At a regular meeting on March 27, 1956, the City Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the application of yourself and Marion E. Underhill for the annexation of the west 332 feet of the E½ of the SW¼, Section 20, T20N, R61E, NEEM be approved.

The Board of City Commissioners will consider this recommendation on April 4 at their next regular meeting.

Yours very truly,

FRANKLIN J. NILES, Sec'y.
City Planning Commission

FJB/wt

cc: City Manager

M I N U T E S
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 27, 1956

A regular meeting of the City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:40 P.M. by Chairman Stewart in the Council Chamber of City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Stewart, Vice-Chairman Tiberti; Messrs. Phelps, Rather, Borin, Sharp and Kennedy.

ABSENT : Messrs. Schmutzer, and Hawkins.

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning Franklin J. Bills; Associate Planner Shawnee Stewart, and Recording Secretary Wanda Trent.

OTHERS PRESENT: Charles Knaus and Kenneth Hanson of the City Engineering Department.

MINUTES: Upon motion by Mr. Tiberti, seconded by Mr. Phelps, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the Meeting of March 8, 1956 as written.

OLD BUSINESS:

Carter St. A petition received from the property owners in the area between Bonanza Road and Washington Avenue, bounded on the East by Tonopah Drive and on the West by Dike Lane, to secure a City Street on the land now called Carter Street, deferred from the meetings of February 28 and March 8 to allow the Commission to personally inspect the area in question, was again presented.

Upon motion by Mr. Tiberti, seconded by Mr. Borin, the Commission unanimously voted to refer this problem to the City Right-of-Way Department to see if additional land could be acquired for a fifty (50) foot right-of-way coming out on Dike Lane or Tonopah Drive but not onto Bonanza Road.

Amendment Ord. #507 A proposal of the Planning Staff for the amendment of Sections 8, 10 and 20 of Ordinance #507 was referred to a Committee composed of Messrs. Borin, Phelps and Schmutzer for further study.

Annexation Sec. 20 { A petition for the annexation of the West 332 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, deferred from the meeting of March 8, 1956 was again presented.

3/27/56

Annexation
Sec. 20
(Cont.)

Messrs. Reardon, Struthers and Whittington were present urging approval of this proposed annexation.

Upon motion by Mr. Tiberti, seconded by Mr. Phelps, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the petition for the annexation of the West 332 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M be approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

Virginia
Manor #1

The tentative map of Virginia Manor #1, an area of three acres located North of Madison between "M" and "N" Streets was presented by the Director of Planning who recommended approval.

Upon motion by Mr. Phelps, seconded by Mr. Rather, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the tentative map of Virginia Manor #1 subject to an equitable agreement with the Las Vegas Union School District.

Judy Rich
#2

The tentative map of Judy Rich Tract #2, an area of 2.73 acres located in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 4, T21S, R61E, MDB&M was presented by the Director of Planning who told the Commission that this was a resubmission of a tentative subdivision originally approved over a year ago and that it was essentially the same as was previously submitted and approved.

Upon motion by Mr. Tiberti, seconded by Mr. Borin, the Commission unanimously voted approval of the tentative map of Judy Rich #2.

Ensley Place
#1

The tentative map of Ensley Place #1, an area of twelve and one-half (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) acres located in the N $\frac{1}{2}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 28, T20S, R61E, MDB&M was presented by L. E. Tyson, Engineer for this tract. After much discussion as to the present zoning of the area and the lack of an alley backing the commercial property, Mr. Borin moved that the tentative map of Ensley Place #1 be approved subject to an equitable agreement being reached with the Las Vegas Union School District. This motion was seconded by Mr. Phelps and upon roll call, the ayes and nays were as follows:

A REPORT ON THE PETITION TO ANNEX THE WEST 332 FEET
OF THE SE $\frac{1}{4}$ OF THE SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SEC. 20,
TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, MDB&M

March 27, 1956

I. SIZE AND LOCATION:

The parcel under consideration is approximately 10 acres in size and is located North of Vegas Drive and directly North of Twin Lakes Village Tract #5 and East of Highway #95. It is located within the area which the Board of City Commissioners has indicated a desire to annex.

II. ADJACENT PROPERTIES:

The general feeling of the Planning Commission on this matter was first considered at the last regular meeting. It was that some study should be given to the possibility of annexing adjacent properties at the same time. We have been able to make contact only with owners of the adjacent 30 acres in the same quarter-quarter who has indicated that, while he would not be willing to present any petition for annexation at this time he would, in his own words, "be willing to go along with the City's wishes to annex the property".

III. ZONING:

According to the County Planning Commission Staff, the property under consideration is presently zoned R-E by the County and therefore, must be annexed with that zoning classification. To develop it in the manner which the applicant has indicated would require a change in zoning classification to R-1.

IV. DRAINAGE AND SANITATION:

Preliminary studies by the City Engineering Department indicates that this property may be serviced with sanitary sewage lines and can be so designed so that it would provide adequate drainage. However, the Engineering Department does not feel that the design suggested is necessarily the best possible design.

V. DEVELOPMENT:

While the staff offers no objections whatsoever to the annexation of this property, we do feel that the development of it into single family

residential lots with the design outlined by three cul-de-sacs will most definitely present us with a future problem in the proper development of this general area. The applicant has indicated that his suggested design, which effectively seals the property from the adjacent acreage stems from suggestions made by the FHA. However, we feel that a more satisfactory street pattern, both from the viewpoint of this particular applicant and from the viewpoint of overall planning of the area can be successfully worked out with the cooperation and assistance of the FHA.

In support of this position, it should be noted that your staff discussed this matter informally with officials of the FHA on March 27. During this discussion, the FHA Official made a number of noteworthy comments: (1) That the FHA, as of this date, has made no definite commitment regarding the development of this property; (2) That the FHA will frown on the applicant's proposal to leave the Vegas Drive frontage undeveloped at the present time in the hope that it may subsequently be developed for commercial uses; (3) That from the FHA's point of view, it would be more important to seal the property off from the adjacent property to the West rather than the adjacent property to the East and therefore, if cul-de-sac design is necessary, the cul-de-sac should extend Westerly from a street along the eastern boundaries of the property rather than the reverse which is now proposed by the petition.

FRANKLIN J. BILLS

FJB/wt

OFFICE OF THE CITY ENGINEER

INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

DATE: March 27, 1956


File: 503.4 - KH

TO: Director of Planning
FROM: Director of Public Works
SUBJECT: Annexation - 330' SE $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{2}$ of
Section 20, Township 20S, Range 61E
Rardon Annexation

Preliminary study of the proposed annexation and the future development of this land reveals the following:

1. Sanitary service can be obtained by connection to Twin Lakes #5 sanitary lines.
2. Surface runoff is in an easterly direction. However, by tentative plat it will be necessary for this layout to drain south. General course will be through Twin Lakes #5. Further consideration should be given to this run-off. It is not advisable to drain into another development.

With adequate study of design the annexation is acceptable to this office.


G. E. Wade
Director of Public Works



md.

NEW BUSINESS:

Annexation Section 25 A petition for the annexation of the Northeast quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$); and the West 660 feet of the South 330 feet of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$); Section 25, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M was presented by Mr. Bills.

Harley King and Homer Carey, the petitioners, were present urging approval.

Mr. Bills told the Commission that since the State Legislature had enacted legislation to allow the Northeast quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 25, T20S, R61E, MDB&M to withdraw from the City of North Las Vegas, he could see no reason why it should not be annexed to the City of Las Vegas.

Upon motion by Mr. Borin, seconded by Mr. Rather, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the annexation of the Northeast quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$); and the West 660 feet of the South 330 feet of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$), Section 25, T20S, R61E, MDB&M be approved.

Annexation

Section 20

A petition for the annexation of the West 330 feet of the Southeast quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$), Section 20, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, although not on the agenda, was presented to the Commission for discussion. Mr. Reardon was present requesting approval for this annexation. He told the Commission that the developer was prepared to dedicate twenty-five (25) feet of land on the West, thirty (30) feet on the North to tie in with Harrison and fifteen (15) feet on the South to make the required eighty (80) feet on Vegas Drive.

The Director of Planning said the planning staff has not had time to go over the land thoroughly so he could not make a firm recommendation at this time although he thought it was rather logically a part of the city.

The concensus of the Commission was that it should be held over until the next regular meeting to give the Planning staff time to check it over.

March 12, 1956

Engineering Department

Director of Planning

Petition for Annexation - W 330', SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 20, T20S, R61E

Attached hereto is one copy of a map submitted by E. O. and Marion L. Underhill along with a petition for the annexation of the West 330 feet of the Southeast quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$), Section 20, T20S, R61E, MDB&M.

Your comments relative to drainage and sanitary sewage disposal for this area will be appreciated. This petition will again be presented to the City Planning Commission on March 27.

FRANKLIN J. BILLS

wt

March 12, 1956

Mr. E. O. Underhill
2916 Ashby Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Underhill:

At a regular meeting on March 8, 1956, the City Planning Commission considered the petition signed by yourself and Marion L. Underhill for the annexation of the West 330 feet of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 20, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

The Commission voted to defer action on this petition so that the Planning Staff could give it more study. The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission will be held on March 27, 1956 and this petition will again be discussed at that time.

Yours very truly,

FRANKLIN J. BILLS
Director of Planning

wt

February 1980

Honorable Mayor and
Board of City Commissioners
Las Vegas, Nevada.

RE: RESOLUTION:

To (1) re-designated and (2) hold the name of the following described parcel, to-wit:

The west 150 feet of the southeast one-fourth (SE 1/4) of the southeast one-fourth (SE 1/4) of Section 20, Township 30 South, Range 61 East, S.41.E., contains ten (10) acres, more or less, and being contiguous to the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, to hereby add to the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, all said real property so

Witness my hand and seal this 25th day of February, 1980.

E. W. Underhill
Marian S. Underhill

~~2915~~ 2915